

REMARKS

By this amendment, claim 1 has been further amended and claim 12 is amended.

In claim 1, it has been specified that said oscillatory motion is caused by said diving means.

In claim 12 an obvious mistake has been corrected by replacing “frame” by “housing” as the term “frame” has no antecedent basis in claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for lack of clarity as to what the “abrasive driving means” is driving.

Claim 1 has now been amended to recite that the oscillatory motion is “caused by said driving means”. This clarifies the claim and removes the objection.

Applicant appreciates the suggestions from Examiner BUI made on July 21, 2007.

Claims 2-20 were rejected as being dependent on the objected-to claim 1. However, this objection is removed by the amendment to claim 1.

In view of the above the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the objection raised and an indication that the application can pass to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Gabriel BERNAZ

October 15, 2007

By: /Michael O. Sturm/
Michael O. Sturm
Reg. No. 26,078

STURM & FIX LLP
206 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1213
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-4076
Telephone: (515) 288-9589
Telefax: (515) 288-5311
e-mail: sturm@hslip.com